DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 068 TM 007 565

AUTHOR Kennedy, William R.; Lorish, Christopher
TITLE Sociological and Psychological Antecedents of Evaluation Resistance: A Case of the Data Use and Disuse Phenomenon.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (62nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Objectives; *Change Strategies; Curriculum Development; Elementary Education; Evaluators; Improvement Programs; *Information Utilization; *Motivation; Reading Achievement; *Self Concept; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A two-year project involved two elementary school faculties in planning curricular change. Both schools selected two major goals: to improve reading achievement scores and student self-concept. University personnel served in a consultant/trainer role. The school staffs expressed doubt about the feasibility or the necessity of the self-concept goal; the teachers seemed perplexed about what self-concept was and how they would implement approaches that would raise the self-concept scores of the children. Data presentations outlining the self-concept profiles for each building were essentially ignored. Coupled with the questions about self-concept, the seeds of a suspicion were sown; teachers did not accept self-concept as a causal or important variable in the improvement of reading. This hypothesis is discussed in terms of how teachers view evaluation; the administrative structure of the school system; the relatively unsophisticated level of data conception held by teachers, and Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivators and hygienic factors which decrease motivation. It is concluded that teachers view self-concept as a hygienic factor in classroom motivation--self-concept is not the key to achievement gains. (Author/GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169068

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Sociological and Psychological Antecedents of Evaluation Resistance:

A Case of the Data Use and Disuse Phenomenon

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William R. Kennedy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

William R. Kennedy
Case Western Reserve University

and

Christopher Lorish
Cleveland Public Schools

Session Number 14.11 Urban School Innovation:
A Test of Theory, Reality, and Solutions (Symposium, Division H)

Paper presented at the 1978 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, March 1978

Printed in U.S.A.

TM007 565

INTRODUCTION

PEECC was a two year project in the Cleveland Public Schools (Ohio) that featured two faculties assuming the task of planning curricular change for their respective schools. Both schools selected two major goals: to increase reading achievement scores and to improve the self concepts of their students. University personnel served in a consultant/trainer role in the two schools.

The reading achievement objective and the overall project evaluation were assigned to central office staff. The self concept evaluation was assigned to a University consultant. This paper was written from the perspectives gained during the self concept evaluation activities.

There appeared to be some second guessing on the part of the school staffs about the feasibility or the necessity of the self concept goal. Near the end of the first year pretesting for a self concept measure, the self concept evaluator and his assistants began to verbalize to one another and to the overall project evaluator concerns that the teachers seemed perplexed about what self concept was and how they would implement approaches that would raise the self concept scores of the children. A decision was made to have the University consultant/trainers, who were actively involved in teaching and supervising skills that the teachers were using to affect change in the school buildings, define and develop self concept enhancement techniques as well. The approach appeared to involve working with target children first and then using the learned skills on the other children in the class.

Data presentations outlining the self concept profiles for each building were essentially ignored. Coupled with the questions about what self concept was, the seeds of a suspicion were sown - teachers did not accept self concept as a causal or important variable in the improvement of reading. This paper looks at that hypothesis and also examines how the structure of the two schools may have operated to effectively block change that would enhance the self concepts of the children.

THE SELF CONCEPT EVALUATION

Product Objective b of the PEECC project stated:

> "b. During years 2 and 3 the children will show significant gains in their self-image as a learner or in their attitude toward school work. The design and implementation of data collection and analysis procedures will be conducted by a team of evaluation consultants with expertise in the areas of attitudinal and self-concept research."

The PEECC project was an educational program that facilitated a process whereby a school building's staff identified the educational and organizational needs of their building and developed curriculum and organization changes to meet those needs. From those deliberations came objectives to affect change in the self-concepts of students concommitant with change on cognitive variables in reading achievement.

As of September 1975, neither staff had finalized their approaches to affecting change in students' self-concepts. School A staff had committed itself to the self-concept change as a goal, while School B staff had not yet decided the degree of commitment they would place on self-concept. Accordingly, it was determined by the self-concept evaluator that some affective measure was necessary to determine the existing level of the target students' self-concepts in terms of a standardized instrument (the Self Observation Scale). This resulted in a measurement of self-concept that was useful for change purposes, even if the two staffs had later decided to define self-concept in their own terms. If the latter course of action had been chosen, then the SOS would have served as a validation instrument for the two staffs' resultant definitions and measurements.

By June 76, the staffs in both buildings had arrived at a definition of self-concept that embodied terms and definitions that were contained in

the SOS. School A still believed that self-concept change should be a major goal, while School B apparently came to the conclusion that self-concept would be secondary to reading achievement. Thus, the self-concept change assessment was conducted using the instrument chosen during the first year of the project. Two comparison schools were added in 76-77.

Instrument

The instrument chosen for measuring purposes was the Self Observation Scale from the National Testing Service in Durham, N.C. There were two forms: primary (first, second, and third grades) and intermediate (fourth, fifth and sixth grades). Scoring was included in the purchasing price.

The primary form had four subscales:

1. self acceptance - high scoring children view themselves as positive, happy, important, and competent. Low scoring children see themselves as inadequate, unsuccessful, and undesirable.

2. social maturity - high scorers see themselves as independent, persistent, and sensitive to other people's needs while low scorers see themselves as quitors and loners, and uncertain in social interactions.

3. school affiliation - high scorers view school as a positive influence in their lives, they enjoy it while low scorers view school as an unhappy place and do not see school as important in their lives.

4. self security - high scorers report low anxiety and emotional stability while low scorers are anxious and uncertain.

The intermediate form had seven subscales:

1. self concept - this replicates the primary form. High scorers see themselves as happy, important etc., while low scorers do not.

2. self security - this is similar to the primary form and high scorers report emotional confidence and stability, low scorers do not.

3. social maturity - high scorers know the importance of such notions as fair play, sharing, perseverance, helpfulness, generosity while low scorers are seen as selfish, inconsiderate, or immature.

4. social confidence - high scorers made friends easily, feel confident while low scorers have difficulty in making friends, etc.

5. school affiliation - high scorers see school as a positive influence in their lives while low scorers do not see school as positive.

6. teacher affiliation - high scorers like their teachers while low scorers do not like their teachers.

7. peer affiliation - children high on this scale see themselves approved of by their peers and like to be with other children while low scorers see other children as unfriendly and have few friends.

The National Testing Service scoring response was a hindrance to effective evaluation. They repeatedly took 6-8 weeks to score the main body of the answer sheets.

Subjects

First Year 75-76

The students were drawn from intact classroom units in the first through the sixth grade. Special classrooms, libraries, kindergarten and other components of the schools' curricula were not tested. Eighteen classrooms at School B and twenty-one at School A had five boys and five girls drawn at random. All of the students tested were black. The students were tested the last week of September and the first week in October.

Not all of the students that were pretested were still in the respective schools during the last two weeks in May when the posttest was administered. Replacements were drawn from the randomized lists of names used in September 1975. Five boys and five girls were again tested.

Second Year 76-77

The first grade was not tested the second year. The same children that were tested in grades one and two from 75-76 were tested in grades two and three. Dropouts from the first year's assessment were replaced with a random draw of a student of the same sex for those grades. Random draws from the second and third grade classes at the two comparison schools were chosen in the same manner as the students from School A and School B in 75-76. All children in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades were tested in all four schools with the self-concept instrument in accordance with the central office evaluator's wishes. The students were tested the last week of September and the first weeks in October.

Students that were still in the schools from grades two and three were tested. No replacements were sought for those that dropped out. All students in grades four, five, and six were tested in all four schools. Two follow-up visits were made to test those students absent from the first testing. If the absent students were still absent, then they were considered dropouts for assessment purposes. The dropout rate was high, as school officials had predicted. Students were tested April 76.

Method

First Year 75-76

All of the students were tested in their intact classroom groupings. The chosen students were called from their regular classes and taken to a room set aside for testing. They were placed at desks that were far enough apart so that no student could see the responses of another student. The directions were read to them twice. Then each question was read aloud twice to minimize any possible reading difficulties. General impressions of the

test administrators were that the students did not mind the test questions and cooperated willingly. The pretest method was repeated for the posttest.

Second Year 76-77

The same strategy used in 75-76 was utilized in 76-77 for the second and third graders. The fourth, fifth, and sixth grades were tested in the intact classroom unit. Thus, the primary groups were tested in groups of ten or less, while the intermediate groups were tested in groups of 20 or more. It was difficult to eliminate a "group answer" effect completely. For example, the question, "this school is like a jail" would frequently cause hooting and yells of yes, etc. The testers read the questions aloud and kept up a good pace to keep interaction time to a minimum. The assessment team believed the data valid. The pretest method was repeated for the posttest.

Results

A complete description of the results was presented in the self-concept evaluation report (Kennedy, 1977). Only a brief summary will be presented here. Tables will be used to cut down prose. Tables 1 through 10 list the pretest and posttest means for the various subscales of the SOS primary and intermediate forms.

There were a fair amount of significant "gain score" analyses. However, an advantage of the SOS was that scores change from year to year, allowing one to examine if growth (or drop) was the result of maturation effects. When maturational analyses were run (one grade's posttest compared with the next grade's pretest) most of the significant gain scores, for both primary and intermediate forms, were shown to be the result of maturation effects.

TABLE 1 Mean T scores for each of the grades and composite for the four subscales on the Self Observation Scale (primary form) for the pretest group and the posttest group at School A 75-76.

Test	N	Grade	Self Acceptance	Self Security	Social Maturity	School Affiliation
Pretest	27	1	52.9	40.7	36.4	53.1
	39	2	55.4	53.7	46.9	53.2
	40	3	53.6	52.9	51.8	54.0
	106	1,2,3	54.1	50.1	46.1	53.5
Posttest	40	1	56.8	53.4	44.8	57.3
	40	2	53.0	51.3	47.4	49.0
	40	3	52.1	53.6	53.6	52.5
	120	1,2,3	54.0	52.8	48.6	52.9

TABLE 2 Mean T scores for each of the grades and composite for the four subscales on the Self Observation Scale (primary form) for the pretest group and the posttest group at School A 76-77.

			SOS Subscales			
Test	N	Grade	Self Acceptance	Self Security	Social Maturity	School Affiliation
Pretest	39	2	55.2	54.9	48.1	54.8
	40	3	51.1	52.5	47.8	51.7
	79	2,3	53.1	53.7	48.0	53.2
Posttest	38	2	56.2	58.3	51.1	55.2
	35	3	51.5	51.0	47.4	47.7
	73	2,3	54.0	54.8	49.3	51.6

TABLE 3 Mean T scores for each of the grades and composite for the four subscales on the Self Observation Scale (primary form) for the pretest group and the posttest group at Comparison School A 76-77.

			SOS Subscales			
Test	N	Grade	Self Acceptance	Self Security	Social Maturity	School Affiliation
Pretest	32	2	53.9	51.0	43.8	54.7
	32	3	47.9	52.2	40.7	47.3
	64	2,3	50.9	51.6	42.2	51.0
Posttest	30	2	51.1	51.0	42.6	48.4
	31	3	50.5	53.3	48.1	50.6
	61	2,3	50.8	52.2	45.4	49.5

TABLE 4 Mean T scores for each of the grades and composite for the four subscales on the Self Observation Scale (primary form) for the pretest group and the posttest group at School B 75-76.

Test	N	Grade	Self Acceptance	Self Security	Social Maturity	School Affiliation
Pretest	30	1	52.3	53.0	44.1	54.1
	30	2	53.9	51.6	46.9	56.0
	29	3	50.7	51.6	42.9	48.6
	89	1,2,3	52.3	52.1	44.6	53.0
Post-test	28	1	55.7	54.3	47.3	58.0
	30	2	55.8	55.3	50.0	55.8
	30	3	50.1	50.2	48.1	50.4
	88	1,2,3	53.8	53.2	48.5	54.7

TABLE 5 Mean T scores for each of the grades and composite for the four subscales on the Self Observation Scale (primary form) for the pretest group and the posttest group at School B 76-77

Test	N	Grade	SOS Subscales			
			Self Acceptance	Self Security	Social Maturity	School Affiliation
Pretest	29	2	50.4	49.2	44.3	50.9
	30	3	56.1	54.3	49.4	53.8
	59	2,3	53.3	51.8	46.9	52.3
Posttest	28	2	52.4	53.1	49.3	51.6
	28	3	52.3	53.7	48.9	49.8
	56	2,3	52.3	53.4	49.1	50.7

TABLE 6 Mean T scores for each of the grades and composite for the four subscales on the Self Observation Scale (primary form) for the pretest group and the posttest group at Comparison School B 76-77.

Test	N	Grade	SOS Subscales			
			Self Acceptance	Self Security	Social Maturity	School Affiliation
Pretest	37	2	50.3	49.1	45.8	50.2
	35	3	48.7	53.2	45.6	48.1
	72	2,3	49.5	51.1	45.7	49.2
Posttest	35	2	46.0	52.9	46.5	46.1
	35	3	48.2	49.7	44.1	44.6
	70	2,3	47.1	51.3	45.3	45.3

TABLE 7 Pretest and Post-test mean T scores for grades 4, 5, and 6 on the seven subscales of the Self Observation Scale (intermediate form) at School A 75-76.

	Grade	N	Self Acceptance	Self Security	Social Confidence	Social Maturity	Peer Affiliation	Teacher Affiliation	School Affiliation
Pretest	4	30	52.7	49.7	43.3	42.8	49.7	49.5	60.2
	5	30	54.2	47.8	44.0	46.3	50.8	51.4	55.8
	6	30	52.2	47.4	48.5	49.9	50.4	52.6	53.4
	4,5,6	90	53.0	48.3	45.3	46.3	50.3	51.2	56.4
Posttest	4	30	52.7	50.7	49.6	47.2	51.4	48.2	54.9
	5	30	53.8	50.1	44.6	47.6	51.0	49.3	53.3
	6	30	52.5	47.1	49.2	49.6	51.3	48.7	48.9
	4,5,6	90	53.0	49.3	47.8	48.1	51.2	48.7	52.3

TABLE 8 Pretest and Post-test mean T scores for grades 4, 5, 6 on the seven subscales of the Self Observation Scale (intermediate form) at School A 76-77.

	Grade	N	Self Acceptance	Self Security	Social Maturity	Social Confidence	Social Affiliation	Teacher Affiliation	Peer Affiliation
Pretest	4	85	53.1	46.3	42.6	44.8	60.4	52.0	46.7
	5	99	47.2	48.7	44.7	44.4	50.0	42.9	45.8
	6	88	52.7	50.0	49.1	45.5	52.2	47.1	52.1
	4,5,6	272	50.8	48.4	45.5	44.9	54.0	47.1	48.1
Posttest	4	69	46.5	50.8	46.2	47.3	46.7	42.6	47.5
	5	80	48.6	50.7	48.9	48.6	48.0	43.9	50.1
	6	77	52.2	51.1	48.5	46.7	52.8	45.7	52.1
	4,5,6	226	49.1	50.9	47.6	47.6	49.3	44.1	50.0

TABLE 9 Pretest and Posttest mean T scores for grades 4, 5, 6 on the seven subscales of the Self Observation Scale (intermediate form) at School B 76-77.

	Grade	N	Self Acceptance	Self Security	Social Maturity	Social Confidence	School Affiliation	Teacher Affiliation	Peer Affiliation
Pretest	4	82	49.3	47.4	40.3	42.4	57.0	47.7	45.1
	5	78	48.2	51.3	44.4	45.9	50.2	42.9	49.2
	6	79	51.2	48.2	47.6	46.1	52.4	49.7	50.0
	4,5,6	239	49.6	48.9	44.0	44.8	53.3	46.8	48.0
Posttest	4	71	50.3	49.6	45.8	47.0	53.1	48.0	48.2
	5	67	46.9	51.9	46.2	48.2	46.6	41.6	50.3
	6	67	54.2	52.3	50.7	53.4	55.9	52.6	53.1
	4,5,6	205	50.5	52.1	47.6	49.5	51.9	47.4	50.5

TABLE 10 Pretest and posttest mean T scores for grades 4, 5, and 6 on the seven subscales of the Self Observation Scale (intermediate form) at School B 75-76.

	Grade	N	Self Acceptance	Self Security	Social Confidence	Social Maturity	Peer Affiliation	Teacher Affiliation	School Affiliation
Pretest	4	30	52.7	46.2	43.4	40.8	44.8	48.8	60.0
	5	30	51.3	46.4	42.9	46.2	47.1	51.2	56.1
	6	30	56.0	51.6	47.5	50.8	53.0	54.6	60.2
	4,5,6	90	53.4	48.1	44.6	45.9	48.3	51.5	58.8
Posttest	4	30	53.2	48.9	46.2	46.0	49.6	49.6	56.1
	5	30	47.4	50.2	45.4	50.5	49.5	43.5	48.2
	6	30	54.3	50.3	50.9	52.6	52.0	52.4	55.8
	4,5,6	90	51.7	49.8	47.5	49.7	50.3	48.5	53.4

TABLE 11 Analysis of covariance on the posttest scores, with the pretest as the covariate, for the four subscales of the Self Observation Scale (primary form) between School A and Comparison School A 76-77.

SOS Subscale	Unadjusted Means		Adjusted Means			
	A	Comp.	A	Comp.	F	p
Self Acceptance	53.9	50.8	53.2	51.6	1.25	
Self Security	54.7	52.2	54.4	52.5	1.91	
Social Maturity	49.1	45.4	47.7	47.0	0.18	
School Affiliation	51.4	49.5	50.8	50.2	0.12	
df = 1,129						

TABLE 12 Analysis of covariance on the posttest scores, with the pretest as the covariate, for the four subscales of the Self Observation Scale (primary form) between School B and Comparison School B 76-77.

SOS Subscale	Unadjusted Means		Adjusted Means			
	B	Comp.	B	Comp.	F	p
Self Acceptance	52.3	47.1	51.4	47.8	5.24	.023
Self Security	53.4	51.3	53.3	51.4	2.01	
Social Maturity	49.1	45.3	48.8	45.5	5.69	.018
School Affiliation	50.7	45.3	50.1	45.8	5.23	.023
df = 1,123						

TABLE 13 Analysis of covariance on the posttest scores, with the pretest as the covariate, for the seven subscales of the Self Observation Scale (intermediate form) between School A and Comparison School A 76-77.

SOS Subscales	Unadjusted Means		Adjusted Means			
	A	Comp.	A	Comp.	F	p
Self Acceptance	49.1	47.4	48.8	48.1	0.40	
Self Security	50.9	52.5	51.2	52.2	1.43	
Social Maturity	47.6	45.9	47.2	46.5	0.78	
Social Confidence	47.5	46.9	47.2	47.3	0.18	
School Affiliation	49.3	46.1	48.6	46.9	3.04	.078
Teacher Affiliation	44.1	42.3	43.2	43.5	0.06	
Peer Affiliation	50.0	49.7	49.7	50.2	0.40	
df = 1,398						

TABLE 14 Analysis of covariance on the posttest scores, with the pretest as the covariate, for the seven subscales of the Self Observation Scale (intermediate form) between School B and Comparison School B 76-77.

SOS Subscales	Unadjusted Means		Adjusted Means			
	B	Comp.	B	Comp.	F	p
Self Acceptance	50.4	50.1	50.3	50.3	0.01	
Self Security	52.0	50.6	51.5	51.0	0.44	
Social Maturity	47.6	46.9	47.7	46.9	1.66	
Social Confidence	49.4	47.6	49.0	47.9	2.39	
School Affiliation	51.8	49.9	51.1	50.5	0.36	
Teacher Affiliation	47.4	45.3	47.5	45.2	5.90	.015
Peer Affiliation	50.4	49.9	50.0	50.2	0.08	
df = 1,455						

The second year of the program had the advantage of two comparison schools being made available for the evaluation process. An analysis of covariance on the posttest scores, using the pretest scores as the covariate, was conducted to contrast each target school with its comparison school. The pre-existing group differences on the pretest were significant, thus calling for caution in interpreting the ANCOVA. However, most of the adjustments were minor in relation to the values of the original scores and the ANCOVA results appeared to be useable.

The ANCOVA analyses, in Tables 11, 12, 13 and 14 showed School B did better than Comparison School B in the second and third grades, while School A did not do better than Comparison School A. On the intermediate level, School A had a significantly higher mean than its Comparison on the school affiliation subscale, while School B had a significantly higher mean than its Comparison on the teacher affiliation subscale. Given the number of dependent variables, one cannot conclude that the target schools successfully raised their students' self-concepts (as measured by the SOS).

Experiences

In order to understand this limited success in achieving the self-concept goals, a brief account of the experiences and impressions that the self-concept evaluation staff garnered during the two year project will be given. It will focus upon aspects of the schools total environment that may have contributed to the failure. A brief analysis of these contextual influences follows the account.

School B, which had strong directive leadership from the principal, possessed a faculty that was passive in large group meetings. The staff appeared to have no focus or cohesion in front of an outsider. The school

was quite orderly and noise was kept to a minimum in hallways and rooms as teachers obviously placed an emphasis on the control of the students. The principal supported the orderly quiet and would discipline children in a quiet manner. Punitive discipline was present in only a few classrooms. The staff reacted in a respectful, passive manner for data presentations but were initially defensive about the results as they were concerned that the results could be interpreted as another example of teachers being responsible for bad news. They sought to establish that the culture from whence the students came was the culprit. In the discussions that followed the data presentation the staff began to ask questions about what self-concept meant. It became evident to the evaluation team that the teachers really had no idea what it meant but they had listed an improvement in it for their second goal. There was no group position on self-concept which resulted in little being done to moderate diverse activity by the teachers. The principal was very receptive to data collection in her school and stated her belief in its necessity. The staff in general cooperated willingly with the evaluation team in the data collection process as individuals.

School A, which had a nominally more democratic leadership style, possessed a faculty that was hostile and contentious in large group settings if the persons in front of the group were perceived as a possible threat (when the persons were not perceived as a threat, the staff was very courteous). The school was perceived by the evaluation staff as containing noisy children and shouting teachers. Punitive discipline was present. The principal enforced discipline by threats or corporal punishment. Some teachers yelled constantly at noisy children who ignored them. The staff reaction to the initial self-concept data presentation in the large group setting was aggressively defensive as they sought to establish that students' self-concept was

the result of the culture - not teacher behavior. In a small group setting the principal allowed an adversarial atmosphere to develop rather than conducting the meeting as an information gathering process. The test was accused by staff members as being racially biased and doubts were expressed as to whether or not a white man could conduct a self-concept evaluation of black school children. The staff at School B had listed self-concept improvement as their primary goal and reading improvement as their second goal. The staff and principal insisted on the absolute importance of self-concept. The questions that were asked seemed to seek verification as to importance of self-concept and what could be done to improve it. The staff talked about self-concept in very general terms. School B's principal and some of the staff conveyed the impression that data collection was an irritant. The majority of the staff, however, was cooperative in the data collection.

In initial meetings prior to data collections both schools viewed the self-concept evaluator as a representative of the central office and were wary of him. The teachers appeared to be laboring under the impression that the self-concept measurement would result in a very negative assessment of their school. Upon hearing the statement that the self-concepts were in the "normal" range, there was a sort of collective sigh of relief at both schools. The data was given to schools but no follow up requests for assistance in interpreting data were made to the evaluator beyond requests for the results of the testing. There may have been a damper on the use of the data due to the unacceptably long time for scoring and grading by the National Testing Service in Durham, North Carolina, publisher of the SOS (the evaluative instrument).

The experiences that have been described so far point out that the two target schools were different in terms of leadership style, degree of

cohesiveness (them versus us), and methods and degree of punitiveness for controlling the students. The two schools were similar in their inability to articulate what self-concept was beyond generalities and how to influence it, while listing it as an important part of the schools mission. Both schools did not achieve meaningful gain in students' self-concept as measured by the SOS. Both schools were similar in their readiness to assign responsibility for self-concept development to external agents rather than themselves. This led the self-concept evaluation team to question the importance of school climate variables in determining the self-concept of the children.

SCHOOL SYSTEM OBSTACLES TO CHANGE

It is proposed that there were several obstacles within the structure of the school system which may have worked against successful implementation of the project as it related to self-concept (and perhaps change in general). These obstacles are not unique to this school system but probably appear in all bureaucratic structures to some extent.

Them Versus Us

In both schools (one school more than the other) there was a definite perception of a "them" central office by the "us" teachers in the field. The overall project evaluator was treated by one school as a threat and an individual who should be "headed off." The threat appeared to be perceived as a struggle over who had control of the project - the building staff or the central office. Even the project manager, with her offices in one of the schools was rarely trated as a colleague by that school's staff. Due to the vagueness of some goals and the absence of mechanics to implement those goals, the project evaluator and the project manager may have been more demanding of the building staffs to sharpen their goals and define the

mechanics than they cared for. As a consequence, the teachers may have perceived them as playing a "policemen" role in the project.

At times the communications between the central office staff and the staff in the school buildings appeared to become quite strained. Furthermore, distrust of the self-concept evaluation staff peaked during times of communication strain within the program. In the beginning of the project, the building staffs erroneously perceived the self-concept evaluator as being from the central office and some hostile attitudes were conveyed by one school's staff. Upon learning that the self-concept evaluator was not from the central office, he was perceived as representing the central office's wishes and viewed as an object to treat with caution. During the second year of the project, the self-concept evaluator was correctly perceived as being from the same University as the project instructors and then politely accepted as a requirement of the project.

Thus, a bureaucratic struggle over perceived control of a project (in this instance the building's curriculum) between the central office and the building staff is a potentially harmful influence on the climate in which an evaluation is to be performed. It does not seem unreasonable to speculate that an evaluation will contribute more to the change process in a positive climate than in a contentious climate. Furthermore, this type of struggle is a potential obstacle to change that all school systems will have to address in order to facilitate change. For this project, this conflict was all the more serious because the staffs believed from the beginning that they could do anything in the project and they probably did not understand the need for evaluation requirements or appreciate their importance. Thus, roles and authority will have to be clearly defined from the beginning of

the project. Perhaps this role definition process should occur before goals and objectives are developed.

Teacher Ignorance of Data

Observations from this project and others in which the authors have participated support a contention that the classroom teacher, in general, does not have a firm grasp of what data is or how to use it. This appears to be true even for the teacher who had an introductory course in measurement in her masters degree work.

Much of the data that the teachers consume is used in a nominal manner and some in an ordinal manner. The teachers classify their students or rank them, perhaps in a rough sense. The data given to them or even the data that they may collect on their own may be at the interval level of measurement, but they consistently try to "reduce" it to an ordinal scale (e.g., test scores to grade equivalent scores or percentile rank scores) or to a nominal level (e.g., test scores to good-bad or acceptable-unacceptable). This tendency for teachers to operate on a simple level of measurement can negate the information available to them from a standardized test that has tried for an interval level of measurement and its appropriate level of conceptualization that can be applied to the problem.

Teachers in both of the target schools did not understand the meaning or potential uses of T scores, the form in which the data was given to them (along with profile graphs). The self-concept evaluator provided T scores over percentile rank scores to provide for a better level of measurement to facilitate the self-concept deliberations the staff were to undertake in the course of the project. Perhaps that was a mistake. The level of data sophistication in public education has increased in the last twenty years

but mainly among the central office staff. The central office staff have improved their data processing skills. They know of and appreciate T scores over percentile rank scores. They, too, were aware (as was the self-concept evaluation team) that the students as a group had many sub-scale scores at or near the mean and that percentile rank scores would have magnified differences that were present but not meaningful.

As a result of the self-concept data presentations, the teachers concluded that the self-concepts of their children fell in an acceptable range and thus may have dismissed self-concept as a major worry. (Or at least they felt this got them off the public hook - as represented by the evaluation. Privately, many still complained about their kids behavior.) Thus, "better data" for use in self-concept evaluation may have contributed to an incorrect decision on the part of the teachers, namely, the self-concept of their students did not need improvement and that increased reading achievement was the important goal. This was a conclusion that was at odds with the stated goals of the program. In pursuit of more sophisticated analyses and potential for information from collected data, the self-concept evaluator may have talked over the teachers rather than at them. This may have been a factor in the teachers not utilizing the data to greater extent in their decision-making about the curriculum reforms they would institute in the schools. The self-concept evaluation may have satisfied the needs of the central office staff and the funding agency, but may not have satisfied the needs of the change agents (the teachers).

Compounding the problem of teachers not being able to effectively handle data, the whole concept of measurement in the affective domain may have also played a role. The area of self-concept, like other affective concerns of the schools, can be characterized as being a science of abstract

terminology. The construct validity of the terms that are used to define self-concept and the necessary transfer to observable behaviors for inference purposes is not strong. Given the level of abstraction and the competing claims as to what will or will not affect the self-concept of school children, foresight indicated the project would have had difficulty getting teachers to effectively tackle the task of changing self-concept (depending upon the definition used) of the students. Hindsight indicated that the level of data measurement may not have facilitated attainment of that goal.

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL OBSTACLES TO CHANGE

It is usually the case that educational programs are based on psychological theories. Students are looked upon as unique and deserving of an individual effort on the part of the teacher to meet their needs. Good pedagogy is frequently defined as individualizing instruction for students. Needs analyses, motivational explanations or approaches, and group membership interactions are frequently defined in terms that address the individual's concerns. Achievement and attitudinal gains or decreases are generally documented with the use of instrumentation that has a psychological construct as its underpinning. An evaluation program that utilizes such instrumentation logically supports such theoretical views of the students.

In examining obstacles to change in a school program, the psychological approaches appeared to lack a significant dimension - social context. Accordingly, sociological viewpoints were examined for explanations. The effects of evaluations on teachers, Lortie's (1975) sociological view of the teaching profession, and motivational theories will be discussed below.

Effects of Evaluation on Teachers

Covington and Beery (1976) made the point that as an evaluation becomes formal and official, the mistakes and errors that occur as a natural part of the learning process are often misinterpreted as failures or deficiences in the project. They believe there are three levels of inhibition to good performance when an evaluative process enters a school. The first is the all consuming atmosphere of evaluation that envelops many evaluators and central office staff. The second is the extrinsic reward structure of an evaluation as contrasted with an ideal intrinsic reward structure that is the best motivator. The third is that the standards for evaluation are set by outsiders, not the participants. In conjunction with the evaluation process Dreeban (1973) points out that teachers have many tasks to solve on their own. They have to meet school demands, carry out cognitive programs in the classroom and must cope with the management of children.

The implication of Covington and Beery's (1976) view is that the process of formative evaluation, which seeks out problems or potential problems, could be construed as a threatening event by insecure individuals as innocent events are seized upon by well meaning evaluators. If a teacher is not sure of what she is being held accountable for, then she will most likely perceive the evaluation process as a potential negative assessment of her efforts - ambiguity creates defensiveness. Beery (1971) has stated that a threat to an individual's self worth comes from a belief that his value as a person depends on his ability to perform the expected tasks, and if failure occurs, he will not be worthy of approval by others, i.e., people will be perceived only as good as their achievement of their goals

or as good as their evaluations. This view of evaluation may not be completely valid for this project because the teachers were involved in the development of the objectives they were to attain. However, if an individual fails to achieve his own developed goals, he will probably develop a sense of failure and will judge himself in a critical fashion (Hoppe, 1930).

Evans (1976) presented another approach to teacher perceptions of evaluation by examining teacher attitudes. Evans states that teachers resist and dislike evaluation on three dimensions as a result of not being involved in the design of the evaluation process. First, there is an ethical dimension that says that no person has the right to evaluate another person. (This would appear to be a contradiction with teachers' practices towards evaluating students). The second dimension concerns possible philosophical conflicts. The teachers instructional objectives and values may be incompatible to evaluation objectives. On first glance this dimension did not appear to be operating in this project since the teachers were involved in the writing of the objectives. However, we have seen how the teachers were not very specific with the purposes of the self-concept objectives for this project. And the third dimension is a personal defensiveness, namely, that teachers will be anxious because they may fear that personal faults or weaknesses would become manifest during the evaluation processes. Both Evans (1976) and Covington and Beery (1976) indicate the potential for raising personal insecurity on the part of the teacher.

Lortie's Sociological View

While one may disagree with Lortie's (1975) scenarios for the future of the teaching profession, one can make use of his perceptive description of the teaching profession to formulate possible contributors to teacher

resistance to evaluation and change in their schools. Lortie's (1975) main contention was that teachers were a conservative population of adults. As a profession, they viewed change with suspicion and had a tendency to trust tried and true ways over maybe's. The teachers viewed nonproductive tasks or time as demeaning the teachers' prime responsibility.

The teachers viewed the classroom from a perspective of boundedness (Lortie, 1975). The classroom walls were perceived as being beneficial because they keep out other adults. This implied a belief on the part of the teachers that other adults were to be viewed as potential hindrances and not as potential help. In describing a good day, Lortie's sample only referred to students in a positive sense. All other people in the day were negative intrusions into the classroom events. Teachers use this boundedness or cellular isolation (classroom) to control opportunities to maximize their psychic rewards - thus they will resist change in the form of alternative instructional strategies or arrangements (Lortie, 1975).

The teachers rated outstanding teachers from their own pasts as individuals that got a lot of work out of them and as ones high on personal characteristics of respect (Lortie, 1975). It did not matter if the teacher was warm or stern. The important variable was work produced by the students. This work lay in the cognitive domain. Lortie's sample of teachers assumed the techniques they were using would work if given the proper support (this assumption supports Lortie's contention that teachers are conservative). Thus, change was defined as more support of what they had always done and wanted to continue to do. The blame for failure was placed on the environment in which they had to teach. Lortie's teachers perceived their leadership roles as balancing the effort to produce work (cognitive domain) and

attending to the expressive needs (affective domain) of their students. Thus, they struck a balance between the two that was weighted towards work (cognitive domain).

Lortie's (1975) data also indicated teacher discomfort with the affective domain. Teachers rarely expressed generalized outcomes with a whole class as a reason for pride unless there was a specific gain in a cognitive area that was well documented by tests (the teachers wanted tangible gains, but they were also hesitant about the validity of the achievement tests).

Lortie reported that his sample of teachers believed that their moral influence (a high hope in the affective domain) could not be measured until adulthood and consequently, that there was uncertainty if the moral influence was actually working. Teachers existed in the present to maximize their psychic rewards "...Teachers equate achievement and psychic earnings..." (Lortie, 1975, p. 141). Thus, Lortie hypothesized that teachers would seek out short term successes and eschew long range goals (self-concept is a long range goal of all schooling). The teachers used student behavior to observe if teaching objectives were being met. Students who showed love and enthusiasm were saying they were learning and loving it and teachers, as all humans do, like to be loved. The teachers described mood as being a cause of good rapport in terms of the students performing well on the cognitive tasks - students did what teachers anted them to do - work.

Lortie (1975) also states that teachers preferred classroom preparation to curriculum activities despite claims to want curriculum control. Furthermore, the teachers did not assume the same lofty goals as the school system because the teachers wanted observable results and to exercise firm leader-

ship. The teachers believed that most teaching would not be able to match the "outstanding" or "exemplary" objectives that the school system central office staffs had set forth (Lortie, 1975). This project would seem to indicate that teachers are willing to participate in making curricular decisions but perhaps fall into the same trap of setting lofty goals as the administration, and perhaps abandon goals that do not result in frequent psychic rewards, e.g., self-concept goals.

Theoretical Views of Motivators

The Herzberg two factor motivation theory (motivator and hygienic factors) proposed that humanistic approaches to motivation will not necessarily bring about change (Herzberg and Synderman, 1959). Herzberg stated that man has relatively few motivators but can become discouraged by a large number of conditions. Work itself is the best motivator and is classified as a motivator. The other factors are hygienic factors which can work against motivation, such as poor working conditions, but do not in turn motivate if made better (sometimes hygienic factors are called demotivators). Gellerman (1963) performed research studies that supported Herzberg's model of motivation. He found that good feelings were keyed to the specific tasks performed, not to outside influences such as money and security. A motivator will uplift attitudes and performances. Hygienic factors will not produce improvements in performance but are requisites to motivation. Therefore, being praised or having an attractive place to work will not motivate an individual but being deprived of that praise, good morale, attractive environment, or being scolded will depress motivation. Consequently, a human relations approch (essentially what most self-concept enhancement programs are) will not motivate, but an individual's control of

his own work will motivate him. Gellerman reported that good leadership practices are really hygienic factors and thus should no be done away with. However, trying to solve the human needs of subordinates will not motivate them - only personal growth will motivate an individual.

Gordon Allport's (1961) position on motivation was that motives are based in self-sustaining behavioral systems that grew out of previous behavioral systems but are functionally independent of them. Behaviors will become ends in themselves and, thus, purposeful and motivating - they will proceed under their own power. Extending this to teaching, Allport's work appears to support Lortie's (1975) finding that teachers want to continue what they have always done and experienced by wanting more support for these activities.

DISCUSSION

Commodity theory states that the less frequent a desired event becomes, the more valued it will become and the more it will be sought after, all other things being equal (Brock, 1968). Much has been written about the perceived "turn-off" of the urban school child. Commodity theory would predict that a reversal of this becomes more desirous as we fail to change it. Teachers and administrators are repeatedly urged to stress self-concept and other affective measures as means to arrest the achievement score declines; the teachers are urged to teach to the affective domain (Bidwell, 1973; Miller and Kennedy, 1975). Teachers are also urged to remember that doing a good job in the cognitive domain is not enough, "Teachers assume affective goals will be met by doing the cognitive tasks. This is an untenable belief" (Khan and Weiss, 1973).

It is a contention of this paper that teachers do not really believe in the affective domain as being the crucial variable in achieving cognitive goals. This statement is made in spite of surveys which show teachers listing affective concerns as areas which need improvement. The authors propose that the high ranking of affective concerns on teacher surveys is the result of professional climate and a response to criticisms of education which attack cognitive domain deficiencies on the ground of improper affective techniques. Lortie's (1975) work supports a conclusion that teachers seek the cognitive domain for their psychic rewards, not the affective domain, a domain which they believe can only be assessed after a student has become an adult.

The return to the basics movement (which at this time is gaining strength) is both a professional and a lay-based phenomenon. The movement appears to implicitly embrace a Herzbergian view of motivation. Research studies have failed to demonstrate conclusively or consistently that the affective domain controls or strongly influences cognitive domain performances. The affective domain is viewed, essentially, as a hygienic factor by a growing body of professionals, rightly or wrongly.

A short examination of the effects of teacher praise and teacher criticism leads one to conclude that the early enthusiasm and acceptance of the Flanders Interaction approach to classroom teaching has not borne fruit. Belief in the utility of warm acceptance and praise, encouragement of pupil initiative, and practice of democracy have not really resulted in achievement gains, but rather, just positive increases in student attitudes (Rosenshine, 1971). However, there is a strong negative relationship between achievement gains and criticism - mild disapproval does not hurt gains but

strong disapproval does adversely affect achievement gains (Evans, 1976). Increased usage of teaching strategies that resulted in higher numbers of tallies in the Flanders extended indirect influence matrix (the so called motivating matrix) has not consistently resulted in self-concept gains by the recipient students (Kennedy, 1976).

Lortie's (1975) teachers expressed the view that self-concept and other affective goals were long range and therefore unattainable in their classrooms - a theoretical goal of the ivory tower educators. In this project teachers also expressed beliefs that the outside environment was more responsible than the school for the child's self-concept indicating a sort of fatalism about their ability to appreciably affect self-concept. The authors propose that teachers view self-concept in a Herzbergian framework - it is a hygienic factor. Teachers report it is the amount of work a teacher gets out of her children that characterizes her teaching abilities and successes; the classroom climate cannot be oppressive or the performance of the students will drop, but improvement of the classroom climate will not necessarily increase cognitive successes (Lortie, 1975). Thus, teachers will not be overly concerned with utilizing data concerning self-concept in a professional sense. They will view it as a measure that can be used to lambaste them and therefore, to be dismissed as a worry and concern if the data is not overly negative.

In this project, an outside consultant was brought in to assess self-concept change. Given the development of insecurity in the teachers about developing the self-concept objectives, perhaps it would have been better to have brought in the outside consultant earlier in the project to help the teachers understand what self-concept was and to have assisted them in

formulating goals and the evaluation mechanisms for those goals. The teachers themselves could have been made responsible for collecting and utilizing the data, i.e., the evaluation consultant would not perform the evaluation but would assist the teachers in evaluating their own inhouse developed goals and the resultant level of attainment in a consultant relationship. Of course, it must be pointed out that union contractual agreements may make this plan unworkable.

Lortie's (1975) description of the cellular organization of the public schools (boundedness) points out that a public school system will resist change EVEN IF PLANNED BY THE TEACHERS THEMSELVES. Since teachers are conservative, i.e., not committed to change as a profession, teacher discomfort will result from pushes for major change. Evaluations are frequently concerned with documenting the occurence of change. The data collection procedures remind teachers they must change. But Lortie's (1975) data showed that teachers view change as helping them do a better job with the techniques they are already using. Self-concept goals are frequently formulated with the implicit understanding that the present methods are not acceptable. The goals challenge the teachers' present methods and will be resisted if teachers are indeed conservative. Since teachers as a profession appear not to accept the importance of the affective domain in terms of rewards but, rather, view success in the cognitive domain as the source of psychic rewards, they will reject self-concept goals in practice, albeit unconsciously perhaps, if not in avowed goals.

Any innovation that has as its goal planned major change in the schools must face the boundedness of the teacher, or she will continue to do as always "within her walls." This project may not have succeeded to the

extent it wished due to a fair degree of the maintenance of the bounded classroom controlled by the teacher, a professional who tends to think that if you leave her alone and just support her fully, then she will succeed - doing it her way (Lortie, 1975). Allport's (1961) view of the motivational effects of behavioral systems implies that a teacher's present way of conducting her classroom would be acceptable to her, therefore, why would there be a strong commitment on her part to changing her behavior? Changing the makeup of the children in the teacher's classroom will not necessarily affect change in that classroom unless an outside lever can spur the teacher to try change. That lever must continue to be present until the new behaviors become self supporting. The authors of this paper have evolved to a somewhat pessimistic view of teacher based change projects that do not provide quick psychic rewards or deal only in the affective domain and do not make provisions for the extra support necessary for change to occur.

Besides the sociological contributions to data disuse, there is the ignorance of the teacher in data consumption. Universities have long been aware of the need to train graduate students in data skills in their graduate programs, but frequently their response is to believe that one or two courses will suffice. It has been the observation of the senior author of this paper that professionals tend to conceptualize problems and solutions at the level of their data sophistication. Individuals who have had one or two statistics and/or research courses will generally formulate a problem and its solution along one dimension, not multiple dimensions or combinations thereof. Teachers generally perceive the evaluation component of a project as a requirement of the funding agency or of the central office which is accountable to the school board for results in the schools. In a project such as this one,

where the teachers had such a large role in formulating goals and objectives and in implementing change, the teachers must be trained in the use of measurements that will be taken for the accountability process of the funding agency. In the "Them versus Us" environment of a large bureaucracy this would seem to be of special concern. Central office staff have come to view evaluation as necessary and very helpful in monitoring a program and providing feedback on the success of project processes. But formative evaluation is rendered useless if the data that is collected is essentially unusable by the planners (in this case the teachers). A one hour or even two presentation is just not sufficient to train people on the information present in a data collection. And an evaluator must take into account the data sophistication of the consumers of the data, not necessarily the sophistication of the funding agency, if he wants the formative evaluation to be effective.

Summary

1. Teachers as a profession do not believe in the affective domain as being crucial to cognitive success. Thus, self-concept objectives will never receive full support as will cognitive objectives. Self-concept and other affective concerns may be privately viewed as another in a series of educational fads.
2. Any educational program that seeks to affect major change in the schools will have to address what Lortie calls the conservative, bounded, professional who is teaching for immediate psychic rewards.
3. Teachers are relatively unsophisticated with data. Evaluators should collect data at a level teachers understand if the teachers are the primary change agents and not necessarily at the level of sophistication that the

funding agency would appreciate. Perhaps a two tier evaluation would have to be conducted.

4. Projects in the public school have got to realize that orientation to an evaluation design and its demands cannot be done in a convenient module. It requires a major effort on the part of the project staff and the central office to ensure effective data utilization.

REFERENCES

Allport, G.W. Pattern and growth in personality. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1961.

Beery, Richard G., Fear of Failure. In T. Winnet (ed.) Social Psychology, Berkeley, CA: Fybate Lecture Notes, 1971.

Bidwell, Charles E. The social psychology of teaching. In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. Travers, R.M., pp. 413-449, Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, 1973.

Brock, T.C. Implications of commodity theory for value change. In A.G. Greenwald, T.C. Brock, and T.M. Ostrom (eds.), Psychological Foundation of Attitudes, New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Covington, Martin V. and Beery, Richard G., Self-worth and school learning. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

Dreeben, Robert. The school as a workplace. In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, R.M. Travers (ed.). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, pp. 450-473, 1973.

Evans, Ellis D. Transition to teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehardt, and Winston, 1976.

Gellerman, S.A. Motivation and Productivity. NY: American Management American Management Association, 1963.

Herzberg, B. Mausner and Snyderman, B. The Motivation to Work. NY: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

Hoppe, Ferdinand. Erfolg und Misserfolg. Psychologische Forschung, 14: 1-62, 1930.

Kennedy, William R. Project Impact Evaluation Third Year. Evaluation of Title III (ESEA) project for Cleveland Public Schools, 1976.

Khan, S.B. and Weiss, Joel. The teaching of affective responses. In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching,R.M. Travers (ed.), Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally, 1973, pp. 759-804.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Miller, Ruth and Kennedy, William R. Cleveland's Project Impact - a self perpetuating inservice program for the urban school. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1975.

Rosenshine, B. Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement. National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, London, 1971.

Wagoner, R. and O'Hanlon, J. Teacher attitude toward evaluation. Journal of Teacher Education, 19:471-475, 1968.